



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,171	07/03/2001	Joakim F. Peleus	025182-0106	9630
30542	7590	01/02/2004	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER			TRUONG, CAM Y T	
P.O. BOX 80278			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278			2172	
DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/898,171	PELEUS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Cam Y T Truong	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant has amended claim 5, added claims 5-12 in the amendment filed on 10/27/03. Claims 1-12 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 599939) in view of Lakritz (USP 6623529).

As to claims 1, 11 and 12, Hilster teaches the claimed limitations:

"inputting a resume into memory, said resume having a plurality of resume contents" as the user 16 requests a first webpage form via the Internet to transfer resume 12 to a database. This information shows that the user system has included a memory to store resume 12 before transferring resume 12 to a database (col. 4, lines 56-60);

"inputting a template into memory, said template having a predetermined number of unique keywords and a predetermined number of unique fieldnames associated with each keyword" as generating a third web page form 92, a structured form having

multiple of fields each field being capable of accommodating a text string within. For example, a user enters asmith@isp.com in Email field. The system allows any user can input his or her email-address in this form. Thus, each text string that is entered by a user in Email field is presented as a unique keyword. The above information shows that the system has included a memory to store web page forms. Each web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 5, lines 35-45);

"normalizing the resume by using the template to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents" as (figs. 6A-6C, col. 5, lines 20-45).

"automatically transferring each normalized resume content to a data field within a database in which said data field is identified by a fieldname which matches the fieldname of the normalized resume content" as transferring of information from each of a plurality of nonuniformly formatted source data streams into a structured database, which contains many data fields, and storing data corresponding to the data strings from the form fields into the database. The system converts resume information of unstructured resume 12 to the format of the highly structured database. Once the information has been stored in the database 14, a search engine at the database service provider site can be used to match inquiries from one or more employer sites (col. 1, lines 55-67; col. 2, lines 1-4; col. 3, lines 15-25; col. 6, lines 15-25).

Hilster does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "preprocessing the resume to determine a language of the resume; preprocessing the resume to determine a resume type based on the determined language of the resume; preprocessing the

resume to determine a resume type based on the determined language of the resume; selecting a template based on the determined language and resume type determined the steps (b) and c”.

Lakritz teaches the claimed limitations:

“preprocessing the resume to determine a language of the resume” as if a document in the language that is first on the priority list is not present on the server, it then looks for the next most appropriate language (col. 5,lines 61-63);

“preprocessing the resume to determine a resume type based on the determined language of the resume” as each document is determined by type and language (col. 18, lines 15-30);

“selecting a template based on the determined language and resume type determined the steps (b) and c) and inputting the template into memory” as when a visitor enters the site, the requested document is automatically served in the visitor’s language and for the visitor’s country by filling in a document template from the master site with the correct language and country content from one or more database. The requested document is stored in server and /or database (col. 5, lines 14-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakritz’s teaching of determining language and type of document and filling document template with correct language and country content from one or more database to Hilster’s in order to allow a system can store or display any resume/document written in any language into a database format to users.

As to claim 2, Hilster does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "at least one keyword matches a sequence of characters contained within a resume heading". However, Hilster teaches that once the resume information has been stored in the database 14, a search engine at the database service provider site can be used to match inquiries from one or more employer sites. Resume information includes a sequence of characters such a Tokyo Central Agency contained within a heading experience. Since a resume is stored in database, when a user enter a keyword to search this database, the system obviously has to match the keyword with any sequence of characters contained with a resume (fig. 7, col. 3, lines 15-25; col. 6, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of matching user's request to stored information in database in order to provide a correct result to a user.

As to claim 3, Hilster does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "at least one keyword matches a sequence of characters contained within at least one resume content". However, Hilster teaches that once the resume information has been stored in the database 14, a search engine at the database service provider site can be used to match inquiries from one or more employer sites. Resume information includes a sequence of characters such a Tokyo Central Agency contained within a heading experience. Since a resume is stored in database, when a user enter a keyword to search this database, the system obviously has to match the keyword with any

sequence of characters contained with a resume (fig. 7, col. 3, lines 15-25; col. 6, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of matching user's request to stored information in database in order to provide a correct result to a user.

As to claim 4, Hilster does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the resume is in a language other than English". Hilster teaches the resume is in a language English (fig. 7). Lakritz teaches that text document is identified as French (col. 17, lines 50-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakritz's teaching of text document is identified as French to Hilster's system in order to allow a system can store any resume written in any language into a database format.

As to claim 5, Hilster does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein in step (c) if a resume is not determined a default template is used based on the determined language". Lakritz teaches automatically retrieving the document in the next most appropriate language for the visitor (col. 5, lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakritz's teaching of automatically retrieving the document in the next most appropriate language for the visitor to Hilster' s system in order to return a document in most appropriate language to users.

4. Claims 6-7, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 599939) in view of Lakritz (USP 6623529) and further in view DuFresne (USP 5835712).

As to claim 6, Hilster and Lakritz disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 5, except the claimed limitation "wherein the default template comprises a group of alternative keywords associated with each filename". DuFresne teaches designing the default template, database or page specified by the appropriate keyword and the name of template. This information indicates the system has included alternative keyword associated with each template name (col. 17, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne's teaching of designing the default template, database or page specified by the appropriate keyword and the name of template to Hilster and Lakritz's system in order to display the populated document in appropriate language to users.

As to claim 7, Hilster and Lakritz disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 6, except the claimed limitation "searching for the alternative keywords of a group to associated a resume content with fielname associated with the group". DuFresne teaches retrieving and extracting fields from a page, template, set, or database definition (col. 16, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Dufresne's teaching of retrieving and extracting fields

from a page, template, set, or database definition to Hilster's system and Lakritz's system in order to display the populated document in appropriate language to users.

As to claim 10, Hilster discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "locating a parcel identifier in the resume, wherein the parcel identifier is a unique character string that is indicative of a particular job board". However, Dufresne teaches a database record is identified by a URL (col. 10, lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Dufresne's teaching of a database record is identified by a URL to Hilster's system and Lakritz's system in order to identify a record or resume for display to a user via Internet.

5. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 599939) in view of Lakritz (USP 6623529) and further in view of DuFresne and Donohue et al (or hereinafter "Donohue") (USP 5987480).

As to claim 8, Hilster, Lakritz, DuFresne do not discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 6, except the claimed limitation "identifying any unmatched resume content not associated with any group of alternative keywords; search the unmatched resume content for a field locator; and associating the unmatched resume content with a fieldname corresponding to the field locator if the field locator is found in

the unmatched resume content". Donohue teaches that a request is received which includes a locator such as a URL identifying a directory and the requested document, the directory identified in the locator is searched for a first default document template corresponding to the requested document. If the first default template exists in the directory, it is selected for use as the document template. If no first default template exists in the directory, the path is changed to a directory, which is one level higher than the directory in hierarchy for a second default template, that is, to the parent directory. If a second default template exists in the parent directory, it is selected for use as the document template. If the second default template does not exist in the parent directory, the two previous steps of changing the path and searching the new directory are repeated until a default template is found or until the highest level directory has been searched (col. 5, lines 25-50). This information indicates that the system has included alternative keywords associated with each filename to identify document template.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Donohue's of the directory identified in the locator is searched for a first default document template corresponding to the requested document to Hilster's system, Lakritz's system, and DuFresne in order to return the populated document in appropriate language to users.

As to claim 9, Hilster teaches the claimed limitation "a sequence of characters that is indicative of resume content in resumes" as name, address, country is a sequence of character that is indicative of resume content in resume (fig. 6C).

6. Claims 1-3, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al (or hereinafter "Fields") in view of Larsen et al (or hereinafter "Larsen") (USP 6088700).

As to claims 1, 11 and 12, Fields teaches the claimed limitations:

"inputting a resume into memory, said resume having a plurality of resume contents" as storing contents in site 107. Contents have plurality of pieces. This information shows that the system has included a memory to store contents (fig. 2; col. 5, lines 4-20);

"preprocessing the resume to determine a language of the resume" as the web pages is typically an HTML file. This information shows the system determines HTML of page (col. 5, lines 1-5);

"preprocessing the resume to determine a resume type based on the determined language of the resume" as determining HTML and text of page (col. 5, lines 1-5);

"selecting a template based on the determined language and resume type determined the step (b) and (c)" as selecting an HTML template 121 that matches the look and fell of the web page before displaying to a user (col. 5, lines 5-30).

"inputting a template into memory, said template having a predetermined number of unique keywords and a predetermined number of unique fieldnames associated with each keyword" as storing host template in 103 site (figs. 2 & 7);

"normalizing the resume by using the template to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents" as (col. 5, lines 1-30).

Fields does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "automatically transferring each normalized resume content to a data field within a database in which said data field is identified by a fieldname which matches the fieldname of the normalized resume content". Larsen teaches that a Form Field Matcher 6 pulls information regarding all the data fields from the Form Fields 7 database and common industry fields from the Industry Common Fields 8 database and sends information in the form of unmatched fields back to the External Entity 1 to compare with common fields. The External Entity (1) verifies common fields and submits the information back to the Form Field Matcher (6) as matched fields. After verification The Form Field Matcher then sorts the common fields (those that were matched) from the uncommon fields (those left unmatched), sending the common fields to the Identified Common Form Fields (9) database, and the uncommon fields to the Identified Unique Form Fields (10) database for storage and retrieval when needed later by a user filling out the registered form (col. 3, lines 40-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Larsen's teaching of matching fields from one

database and sending matched fields to another data for storage to Field's system in order to sort information in database following order for eliminating time searching/retrieving information from one location to another location.

As to claim 2, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "at least one keyword matches a sequence of characters contained within a resume heading" as parsing the HTML source for desired components of the page and retrieve a HTML template that matches the look and feel of the hosting site. The desired components include title of the article, and other items on a page. This information shows that the system has included at least one keyword, which matches the each components of the page such as tile of page. The title of page is represented as a resume heading (col. 5, lines 1-20).

As to claim 3, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "at least one keyword matches a sequence of characters contained within at least one resume content" as parsing the HTML source for desired components of the page and retrieve a HTML template that matches the look and feel of the hosting site. The desired components include title of the article, and other items on a page. This information shows that the system has included at least one keyword, which matches the each components of the page such as tile of page. The other items are represented as resume content (col. 5, lines 1-20).

As to claim 10, Fields and Larsen disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "locating a parcel identifier in the resume, wherein the parcel identifier is a unique character string that is indicative of a particular job board" as a web page is identified by a URL. URL is represented as the parcel identifier (fig. 2, col. 7, lines 25-35).

7. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al (or hereinafter "Fields") in view of Larsen et al (or hereinafter "Larsen") (USP 6088700) and further in view of Lakritz.

As to claim 4, Hilster and Larsen disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "the resume is in a language other than English". Hilster teaches the resume is in a language English (fig. 7). Lakritz teaches that text document is identified as French (col. 17, lines 50-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakritz's teaching of text document is identified as French to Hilster's system and Larsen's system in order to allow a system can store any resume written in any language into a database format.

As to claim 5, Hilster and Larsen disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein in step (c) if a resume is not determined a default template is used based on the determined language". Lakritz teaches

automatically retrieving the document in the next most appropriate language for the visitor (col. 5, lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakritz's teaching of automatically retrieving the document in the next most appropriate language for the visitor to Hilster' s system and Larsen's system in order to return a document in most appropriate language to users.

8. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al (or hereinafter "Fields") in view of Larsen et al (or hereinafter "Larsen") and further in view DuFresne (USP 5835712).

As to claim 6, Fields and Larsen disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 5, except the claimed limitation "wherein the default template comprises a group of alternative keywords associated with each filename". DuFresne teaches designing the default template, database or page specified by the appropriate keyword and the name of template. This information indicates the system has included alternative keyword associated with each template name (col. 17, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne's teaching of designing the default template, database or page specified by the appropriate keyword and the name of template to Fields and Larsen's system in order to display the populated document in appropriate language to users.

As to claim 7, Fields and Larsen disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 6, except the claimed limitation “searching for the alternative keywords of a group to associate a resume content with filename associated with the group”. DuFresne teaches retrieving and extracting fields from a page, template, set, or database definition (col. 16, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne’s teaching of retrieving and extracting fields from a page, template, set, or database definition to Fields’s system and Larsen’s system in order to display the populated document in appropriate language to users.

9. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al (or hereinafter “Fields”) in view of Larsen et al (or hereinafter “Larsen”) and further in view of DuFresne and Donohue et al (or hereinafter “Donohue”) (USP 5987480).

As to claim 8, Fields, Larsen, and DuFresne do not disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 6, except the claimed limitation “identifying any unmatched resume content not associated with any group of alternative keywords; search the unmatched resume content for a field locator; and associating the unmatched resume content with a fieldname corresponding to the field locator if the field locator is found in the unmatched resume content”. Donohue teaches that a request is received which includes a locator such as a URL identifying a directory and the requested document, the directory identified in the locator is searched for a first

default document template corresponding to the requested document. If the first default template exists in the directory, it is selected for use as the document template. If no first default template exists in the directory, the path is changed to a directory, which is one level higher than the directory in hierarchy for a second default template, that is, to the parent directory. If a second default template exists in the parent directory, it is selected for use as the document template. If the second default template does not exist in the parent directory, the two previous steps of changing the path and searching the new directory are repeated until a default template is found or until the highest level directory has been searched (col. 5, lines 25-50). This information indicates that the system has included alternative keywords associated with each filename to identify document template.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Donohue's of the directory identified in the locator is searched for a first default document template corresponding to the requested document to Fields's system, Larsen's system and DuFresne's system in order to return the populated document in appropriate language to users.

As to claim 9, Fields teaches the claimed limitation "a sequence of characters that is indicative of resume content in resumes" as titles of documents and other items that are indicative of page content in pages (col. 5, lines 1-35).

***Contact Information***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor John Breene can be reached on (703-305-9790). The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Cam-Y Truong  
12/17/03



SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER